

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

United States of America,

Plaintiff,

v.  
*Damien Johnson*  
Defendant.

) Case No. 17-0413 JD

) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING  
TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT


FILED  
AUG 16 2017  
SUSAN Y. SOONG  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND AND SAN FRANCISCO  
FILED  
AUG 16 2017  
SUSAN Y. SOONG  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND


For the reason stated by the parties on the record on August 16, 2017, the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from August 16, 2017, to September 27 2017 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factors:

- \_\_\_\_ Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(I).
- \_\_\_\_ The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [circle applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
- \_\_\_\_ Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
- \_\_\_\_ Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
- X Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
- \_\_\_\_ For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(b) and waived with the consent of the defendant under Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 5.1(c) and (d).
- \_\_\_\_ For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1)(E)(F) for delay resulting from removal/transport of the defendant to another district.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 8/16, 2017

  
DONNA M. RYU  
United States Magistrate Judge

  
Karen Floyd  
Assistant United States Attorney

STIPULATED: *RJL*  
Attorney for Defendant